Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) first complied and analyzed data for the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) utilizing the expertise of internal personnel. A draft along with the data was reviewed with the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC). RISEAC advises the Commissioner and Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education on matters concerning: (a) the unmet educational needs of children with disabilities; (b) comments publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities; (c) advises the Rhode Island Department of Education in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618 of the IDEA; (d) advises the RIDE in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal Monitoring Reports under Part B of the IDEA; and (e) advises the RIDE in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. Membership of the committee is composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. Parents of children with disabilities birth through 26 maintain the majority of the Committee Membership. The Membership also includes individuals with disabilities, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, private schools, charter schools, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities foster care and homelessness, vocational, community or business organizations, juvenile and adult corrections and State Child Serving Agencies. The SEAC reviewed the draft and provided suggestions and input. These were incorporated into the final copy of this document. Progress and slippage in meeting the targets in the SPP are discussed in detail in each indicator submitted to OSEP. All indicators are publicly available on the RIDE website at the following link: http://www.ride.ri.gov/Special_Populations/State_federal_regulations/Default.aspx. Each year RIDE publicly reports per 34 CFR 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). This year per OSEP, RIDE will publicly report on Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. This, per OSEP, will occur no later than June 2, 2010. The link to access Rhode Island's public reporting information which details the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP is: https://www.eride.ri.gov/eride2K5/SPED_PublicReporting/ .

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE - Preschool Outcomes

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children

who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Data Collection System

Since 2001, the Rhode Island Department of Education (Early Childhood), in partnership with the Department of Human Services (Child Care Office), has provided professional development to more than 1,300 early care and education providers, including preschool special education teachers, on implementing a system of assessment a) linked with the Rhode Island Early Learning Standards and b) supported by research in the early childhood field regarding appropriate methods of assessing child progress. This system of authentic assessment is comprised of developmentally appropriate tools and strategies including; observation in the child's natural environment, collection of student work, and input from the student's family.

To meet the Preschool Outcomes reporting requirement and to align that measurement of young children's development with the assessment practices described above, the Department of Education conducted an exhaustive search of early childhood outcome-based measures and determined the research-driven, curriculum-based measure most aligned with the state's early learning standards, while also meeting federal data collection and reporting requirements, to be the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System. This assessment system is based on a reliable and valid instrument,

The Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5, which meets all of the assessment standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association of State Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NASECS/SDE). Dr. Richard Lambert, of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, conducted reliability and validity tests of the *Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5* on a sample of over 1,500 low-income children. He concluded that the *Developmental Continuum* has adequate assessment properties. The Creative Curriculum system uses the COSF categories six and seven as the "comparable to same aged peers" threshold. The Early Childhood Outcomes Center guidelines state that children above the 9.68 percentile of functioning for an outcome should be considered comparable. Creative Curriculum uses this threshold as a cutoff for a child to be placed in category 6. Children functioning above the 15th percentile are placed in category 7.

The Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System is a web-based system for documenting authentic assessment practices. It operates as follows:

1. The state purchases subscriptions for each identified district and assigns district data administrators.
2. Those administrators then add approved teachers, who in turn create classrooms and add children who meet the criteria of this reporting requirement.
3. Administrators also add Speech and Language Pathologists (SLPs), who are the primary special educators for some children. They also, in turn, create classrooms and add children who meet the criteria of this reporting requirement.
4. After an entry period (6-8 weeks), the teachers and SLPs conduct an on-line entry assessment based on multiple measures and sources: observational data, children's work samples, assessment/evaluation information, reports from other service providers and parent input that they have been regularly entering into each child's on-line portfolio. This compilation of data serves as the child's entry assessment.
5. Authentic assessment data is then continually collected and recorded in each child's on-line folder for the remainder of the time the child receives preschool special education services.

   In addition to the entry assessment, teachers and SLPs conduct assessments each January, each June, and upon exit for each child. These multiple formative assessments, though not required for federal reporting, are used to guide teacher planning and instruction, as well as to provide clear and specific information to families about their child's progress.
6. District administrators have been provided with established process and procedures for monitoring the status of data entry and ensuring the fidelity of the data.
7. The Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System also includes a data reporting feature that is aligned with the OSEP reporting requirements. This feature organizes the multiple child development objectives assessed by teachers into the three OSEP areas. Each January, the state runs a report using this feature and the system compares the entry and exit assessment data for children who received more than six months of service to determine the level of progress of each child.

Phasing in representative districts

Given the training requirements and expense of purchasing the on-line subscriptions, the state opted to phase in its data collection by beginning with districts which were representative of the population of children served in the state. Within these districts data was collected on all children with Individual Education Programs who services were provided by the district. Sampling was not used. The discrepancy between the number of children included in the data collection and the annual census count used to identify the representative districts, is likely due to out-of district placements and/or children moving from the district after the June census. Because out-of district placements often include children from multiple districts, the state will include out-of-district placements in the data collection process once

all districts have been phased in. This will alleviate confusion in the classroom about who to assess and who is not yet included in the assessment process.

Census data provided by districts in June 2006 was used to identify the initial six districts. In the fall of 2006, the state provided training in authentic assessment and the use of the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System to these first districts. As outlined below in Tables 7A-C, the representative districts included Newport, Coventry, Westerly, Cranston, Smithfield, and Central Falls.

TABLE 7A

Selected Districts	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)
Central Falls		**10**	**57**		**14**
Coventry	**1**		**1**	**1**	**71**
Cranston	**5**	**13**	**18**		**162**
Newport		**9**	**14**		**50**
Smithfield					**42**
Westerly	**2**		**2**		**41**

TABLE 7B

Total Child Count	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)
SELECTED DISTRICTS	**8**	**32**	**92**	**1**	**380**
STATE	**41**	**169**	**438**	**26**	**2127**

TABLE 7C

% of population	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)
SELECTED DISTRICTS	1.64%	6.54%	18.81%	.20%	77.71%
STATE	1.46%	6.03%	15.64%	.93%	75.94%

In 2007, an identical district identification process was conducted using available census data, and an additional eight districts were identified. Tables 7D-F report the data used in this process. Training in the use of authentic assessment and the use of the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System was again provided to both original districts and new districts.

TABLE 7D

Selected Districts	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)
Central Falls		10	57		14
Coventry	1		1	1	71
Cranston	5	13	18		162
Newport		9	14		50
Smithfield					42
Westerly	2		2		41
East Providence	1	10	6	4	99
Foster					6
Pawtucket		22	56	1	81
West Warwick	1	1	3		71
Glocester				1	24

North Smithfield			**3**		**36**
Jamestown		**1**			**12**
Middletown	**1**	**2**	**1**		**31**

TABLE 7E

Total Child Count	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS	**11**	**68**	**161**	**7**	**740**
STATE	**41**	**169**	**438**	**26**	**2127**

TABLE 7F

% of population	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS	**1.11%**	**6.89%**	**16.31%**	**.71%**	**74.97%**
STATE	**1.46%**	**6.03%**	**15.64%**	**.93%**	**75.94%**

In 2008, the following districts were added: North Kingstown, Cumberland, Woonsocket, and Portsmouth. Census data was again used to identify these districts and Tables 7G-I illustrate the representativeness of the districts which participated.

Table 7G

Selected Districts	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)

	Central Falls	0	12	72	0	11
	Coventry	2	0	2	1	99
	Cranston	11	18	23	0	174
	Newport	0	9	10	0	44
	Smithfield	0	0	1	0	46
	Westerly	3	0	1	1	44
	East Providence	5	24	11	5	107
	Foster	0	0	0	0	10
	Glocester	0	0	1	0	18
	Pawtucket	2	26	52	3	87
	West Warwick	3	2	7	0	75
	North Smithfield	0	0	1	0	42
	Jamestown	0	0	0	0	11
	Middletown	3	2	2	0	36
	North Kingstown	0	2	1	0	80
	Woonsocket	9	23	47	3	145
	Cumberland	1	2	1	0	93
	Portsmouth	1	0	1	0	36
	Totals	40	120	233	13	1158

Table 7H

Total Child Count	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS	**40**	**120**	**233**	**13**	**1158**

STATE	**69**	**215**	**523**	**24**	**2154**

Table 7I

% of population	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS	**2.56%**	**7.67%**	**14.9%**	**.83%**	**74.04%**
STATE	**2.31%**	**7.20%**	**17.52%**	**.80%**	**72.16%**

In 2009, two of the largest districts in the state, Warwick and Providence, were phased into the data collection. Census data was again used to identify these districts and Tables 7J-L illustrate the representativeness of the districts currently participating. It is anticipated that the remainder of the state and out-of-district placements will be phased in during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table 7J

Selected Districts	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (Not Hispanic)	Hispanic	Native American	White (Not Hispanic)
Central Falls	0	12	72	0	11
Coventry	2	0	2	1	99
Cranston	11	18	23	0	174
Newport	0	9	10	0	44
Smithfield	0	0	1	0	46
Westerly	3	0	1	1	44
East Providence	5	24	11	5	107

	Foster	0	0	0	0	10
	Glocester	0	0	1	0	18
	Pawtucket	2	26	52	3	87
	West Warwick	3	2	7	0	75
	North Smithfield	0	0	1	0	42
	Jamestown	0	0	0	0	11
	Middletown	3	2	2	0	36
	North Kingstown	0	2	1	0	80
	Woonsocket	9	23	47	3	145
	Cumberland	1	2	1	0	93
	Warwick	2	3	1	1	224
	Providence	17	86	256	2	100
	Totals	59	209	490	16	1482

Table 7K

Total Child Count	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS	59	209	490	16	1482
STATE	69	215	523	24	2154

Table 7L

% of population	**Asian/Pacific Islander**	**Black (Not Hispanic)**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**White (Not Hispanic)**
SELECTED DISTRICTS as %	2.62%	9.26%	21.72%	0.71%	65.69%
STATE as %	2.31%	7.20%	17.52%	0.80%	72.16%

In 2009, RIDE intensified its focus on two areas essential to the measurement of preschool outcomes:

1. **Training of administrators and early childhood special education professionals**

Training and technical assistance supports to districts were redesigned and structured to provide early childhood special education professionals and administrators with a clearer understanding of the RIDE established policies and procedures targeted at ensuring the fidelity of the outcomes data. Training for early childhood special education professionals was focused on development and implementation of authentic assessment skills and strategies for outcomes measurement using creative curriculum.net.

Early Childhood Special Education Teachers participated in two full days of training. The first day of training was in authentic assessment taught by a Rhode Island Early Learning Standards certified trainer. The second day of training focused on the technical use of cc.net as well as training in the use of cc.net not only as an assessment tool but also as an integral component of the teaching process. This training was provided by a local consultant with expertise both in creative curriculum.net and early childhood education as well as RIDE early childhood special education staff.

Speech Language Pathologist working in early childhood special education participated in a full day of training developed specifically for this group. The training for SLPs was specifically designed and adapted to foster the development of authentic assessment and implementation of creative curriculum.net within the context of the speech language therapy sessions. Attention was given to assist SLPs in extending assessment competencies into all three outcome categories. Trainings were conducted by an SLP with experience and expertise in early childhood assessment and intervention, a local consultant with expertise in both creative curriculum.net and early childhood education and RIDE early childhood special education staff.

Trainings for administrators have continued to be provided during a half day session with a focus on the administrator's role in supporting data collection and ensuring accurate and complete data. Additionally, the local consultant provided them with training in the technical use of the on-line Creative Curriculum system.

2. Developing effective monitoring and support plans at both state and district levels.

Based on district feedback, additional guidance was provided regarding process and procedures related to child outcomes measurement and creative curriculum.net. The Child Outcomes Leadership Group comprised of district administrators was established and meets quarterly to establish collaboration and continuity in improving state-wide practice in measurement of early childhood outcomes. Additionally, a monthly OUTCOMES MATTER newsletter was developed with the goal of providing district leadership with ongoing information, guidance and resources to develop effective administrative monitoring and support plans. A local consultant was hired to develop and implement a state-level monitoring plan to support districts in the implementation of the policies and procedures essential to ensure the fidelity of preschool outcomes measurement. This allows RIDE to not only more accurately assess preschool outcomes, but also provides the data to inform interventions and supports. This data has already indicated the need for developing Level II training both for early childhood special education professionals and administrators designed to not only improve the fidelity of the data but also inform practice and improve teaching and learning through authentic assessment and measurement of outcomes.

Progress Data for FFY 2009 (2008-2009):

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	**Number of children**	**% of children**
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	**10**	**3%**
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	**25**	**7%**
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	**35**	**9%**
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	**76**	**20%**
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	**227**	**61%**
Total	**N=373**	**100%**

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	**Number of children**	**% of children**
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	**14**	**4%**
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	**32**	**9%**
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	**30**	**8%**
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	**69**	**18%**
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	**228**	**61%**

Total	**N=373**	**100%**

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	**7**	**2%**
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	**32**	**9%**
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	**15**	**4%**
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	**65**	**17%**
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	**254**	**68%**
Total	**N=373**	**100%**

Baseline Data for Preschool Children Exiting 2008-2009

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or **exited the program**	**76%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or **exited the program**	**81%**
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or **exited the program**	**68%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	**80%**

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	**67%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program	**86%**

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data reported above reflects information from sixteen (16) of the state's thirty (30) districts serving preschool children with disabilities. Included are all preschool children with disabilities being served, with the exception of children in placements outside of the district. As reported above in Tables G-I, the selected districts are representative of the state as a whole. The state is following its plan to phase in districts over time and will not collect state-wide data until the 2010-2011 school year. The quality of the 2008-2009 data was reviewed with district administrators in a meeting on January 13, 2010. In a comparison to 2007-2008 data, general similarities in trends related to the percentages of children reported in categories "a" and "e" were identified. Rhode Island data was also compared to information about data from other states with respect to those two categories. In general, trends in RI do not appear dissimilar from other states. Several concerns impacting the quality of the data were identified during the review process. The lack of a reliability measure for the professionals conducting the ongoing authentic assessment data collection was identified as a primary concern. District level of monitoring and support for data collection was also an identified issue. With regard to data analysis, a primary concern was the inability to look at data for sub-groups of children. This results in an inability to drill down into category "e" to determine who the large percentage of children in that category are. Additionally, the state-level capacity to design, deliver, and support the training and technical assistance to the 2008-2009 cohort of participating districts was significantly compromised and potentially impacted the quality of the data collection.

Targets for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2009 (2009-10) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and Reported in Feb 2011 and Feb 2012

Summary Statements	Targets FFY 2009 (% of children)	Targets FFY 2010 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	**71%**	**73%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	**76%**	**78%**
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	**63%**	**65%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	**75%**	**77%**
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program	**62%**	**64%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	**81%**	**83%**

Rhode Island opted to set targets based on the quality of data, as opposed to the potential for program improvements. Many improvements have been implemented to the training and technical assistance supports related to data collection that the state is able to provide, however,

most of those changes were implemented in the 2009-2010 school year. Specifically, the state's capacity to monitor the data collection and to support district level data monitoring in 2008-2009 was compromised by a lack of capacity and make the cleanliness of the data an issue of concern. Additionally, the available data comes from a little more than half of the districts in the state as the state plan to phase in districts to the data collection does not conclude until the 2010-2011 school year. Finally, concerns exist about the quality of the data being collected. Specifically, the lack of a process for establishing observational reliability for classroom teachers and the fact that the use of teams to make entry and exit decisions is not widespread are reasons to view the quality of the 2008-2009 with caution. Consequently, Rhode Island opted to set baseline targets at >5% of the current data and to focus our improvement activities on improving the quality of the data.

<table>
<tr><th>FFY</th><th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th></tr>
<tr><td>2005
(2004-2005)</td><td>State submitted required plan for collecting and reporting child outcome data.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2006
(2005-2006)</td><td>
New Indicator: Status at entry data reported.

Outcome Indicator 1: Positive social and emotional skills
• 52% (170) entered at a typical level of functioning
• 48% (154) were not at a typical level of functioning

Outcome Indicator 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills
• 53% (170) entered at a typical level of functioning
• 47% (153) were not at a typical level of functioning

Outcome Indicator 3: Use of appropriate behaviors
• 65% (204) entered at a typical level of functioning
• 35% (111) were not at a typical level of functioning

Total number of children = 324
</td></tr>
<tr><td>2007
(2006-2007)</td><td>
Progress data:

Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
<table>
<tr><th>ECO Recommended Expanded Categories</th><th>Number of Children</th><th>Percent of Children</th></tr>
<tr><td>a. children who did not improve functioning</td><td>1</td><td>1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td><td>3</td><td>4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td><td>4</td><td>6%</td></tr>
<tr><td>d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td><td>11</td><td>16%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

	e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	50	72%
	Totals	**69**	**100%**

Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. children who did not improve functioning	2	3%
b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3	4%
c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	6	9%
d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	14%
e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	48	70%
Totals	**69**	**100%**

Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. children who did not improve functioning	1	1%
b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	1%
c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3	4%
d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	12%
e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	56	81%
Totals	**69**	**100%**

2008
(2007-2008)

Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. children who did not improve functioning	9	5%
b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11	6%
c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	6%
d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	34	18%
e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	122	65%
Totals	**188**	**100%**

Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number	Percent

		of Children	of Children
	a. children who did not improve functioning	8	4%
	b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	14	7%
	c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	17	9%
	d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	24	13%
	e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	125	66%
	Totals	**188**	**100%**

Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs

	ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
	a. children who did not improve functioning	8	4%
	b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	3%
	c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10	5%
	d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	30	16%
	e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	134	71%
	Totals	**188**	**100%**
2009 (2008-2009)	**Baseline data**		

Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
	a. children who did not improve functioning	10	3%
	b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	25	7%
	c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	35	9%
	d. children who improved functioning to reach a level	76	20%

comparable to same-aged peers		
e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	227	61%
Totals	**373**	**100%**

Summary Statements

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **76%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program. **81%**

Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. children who did not improve functioning	14	4%
b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	32	9%
c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	30	8%
d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	69	18%
e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	228	61%
Totals	**373**	**100%**

Summary Statements

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **68%**
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program. **80%**

Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs

ECO Recommended Expanded Categories	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. children who did not improve functioning	7	2%
b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	32	9%
c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-	15	4%

	aged peers but did not reach it		
	d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	65	17%
	e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	254	68%
	Totals	**373**	**100%**
	Summary Statements 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **67%** 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they exited the program. **86%**		
2010 (2009-2010)	**Progress data to be reported.**		

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activity	Timelines	Resources
Improve Training and Technical Support Convene an end-of-the-year meeting with current districts to explore successes, challenges, and recommendations for future.	Complete annually through 2010	**RIDE staff**
Improve Training and Technical Support Develop manual which outlines the basic steps and frequently asked questions of outcomes measurement	Complete by August 2009 COMPLETED	**RIDE staff**
Improve Training and Technical Support Redesign authentic assessment training to offer more opportunities to practice assessment techniques, record data on-line appropriately, link assessment to curriculum planning	Complete by September 2010	**RIDE Staff and expert consultants**
Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection Refine training for administrators in interpreting and using Creative Curriculum data, supervising the outcomes data collection, and supporting special educators in observing and documenting children's	Revise training annually each July. Schedule training sessions for September-	**NECTAC, Creative Curriculum, ECO**

functioning effectively.	October through 2010 COMPLETED for 2009	
<u>Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection</u> Revise state level monitoring systems to collect and review district level policies and procedures related to outcome measurement	Complete by June 2009 COMPLETED	**RIDE staff**
<u>Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection</u> Develop guidelines for identifying assessing children whose progress will best be measured using an alternate assessment	Complete by September 2010	**RIDE staff**
<u>Improve observation reliability</u> Research methods of implementing reliability training for teachers in child observation to enhance current training plan. Review new assessment tool – Teaching Strategies Gold – which includes a reliability determination component.	Complete research by September 2010. Revise current training plan as necessary.	**NECTAC, State of NJ, ECO, Creative Curriculum**
<u>Improve observation reliability</u> Develop training and technical assistance support for speech and language pathologists specific to the area of child assessment	Complete by August 2009 COMPLETED	**RIDE staff**
<u>Determine fourth representative cohort to be phased in</u> Use eRIDE data system to determine additional districts to be phased in.	Complete by August 2009 COMLPETED	**eRIDE**
<u>Send notification letters and provide information session for new districts</u> Host information and overview session for new districts to prepare them for fall implementation of assessment system	Complete by September 1, 2009 COMPLETED	**RIDE staff**
<u>Design training</u> Design training in use of authentic assessment and technical use of the on-line system for all eliglible districts incorporating research on reliability training and feedback from first three cohorts.	Complete annually by September 1 through 2010	**RIDE staff**
<u>Design training</u>	Complete by September	**RIDE staff**

Design guidelines and training to support the use of teams to make entry and exit determinations for all children	1, 2010	
<u>Determine fifth representative cohort to be phased in</u> Use eRIDE data system to determine additional districts to be phased in.	Complete by August 2010	**RIDE Staff**
<u>Evaluate data</u> Using guidance from ECO Center, review data for trends which might indicate data quality concerns or professional development needs.	Complete annually through 2010	**RIDE Staff**